

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 7 are the only independent claims. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. No new matter has been added by this amendment. Claims 11 and 12 have been cancelled. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for withdrawing the finality of the previous Office Action.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leapman et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0198008) in view of Baker (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,735). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration based on the following arguments.

Amended claims 1 and 7 each explicitly require that “the graphic display chip **simultaneously supports the output of a LVDS digital signal and VGA analog signals of the VGA signals**, and when the display is separated from the base, the switch circuit on the main board sends an LVDS signal output from the graphic display chip directly to the LCD screen for imaging, **and simultaneously outputting the VGA analog signals to a VGA interface** for use by an image display device.” (Emphasis added). These limitations as recited in amended claim 1 and 7 are not disclosed in the figures or the cited language of the art of record.

The Office Action admits that Leapman et al. fails to teach these limitations of claim 1 and has cited Baker to cure this deficiency. The Office Action has cited Figures 2, 4, and 5 and col. 2, line 2-32, col. 4, lines 38-53, 62-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5 in rejecting these limitations. The most relevant sections of the cited portions of Baker merely states that “the lid/display screen structure 20 may be selectively and operatively coupled to the circuitry in the notebook computer base housing 12 by either (1) inserting the LVDS connector 24 into the base housing socket 24a, thereby directly connecting the lid/display screen structure 20 to the base housing circuitry when the base housing 12 is removed from the docking station 34, or (2) inserting the LVDS connector 24 into the support arm socket 24b to thereby indirectly couple the lid/screen structure 20 to the docked base housing portion 12 via the lines 46,48.” (Col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 5.)

Baker shows that an LVDS signal is output to the LCD screen for imaging when the display is separated from the base. Baker does not teach that the “graphic display chip **simultaneously** supports the output of a LVDS digital signal and VGA analog signals of the VGA signals.” (Emphasis added). Further, Baker does not teach that when the “display is separated from the base, the switch circuit on the main board sends an LVDS signal output from the graphic display chip directly to the LCD screen for imaging, and **simultaneously outputting the VGA analog signals to a VGA interface** for use by an image display device” as is recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art and is allowable for at least this reason.

It would not be obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Leapman et al. with Baker. But even when both references are combined, they fail to teach or suggest to one of the ordinary skill in the art to output **simultaneously and respectively** the LVDS digital signal and the VGA analog signals from the graphic display chip to the LCD screen and the VGA interface, when the display is separated from the base as required by the amendment independent claims. Therefore, amended claim 1 is believed allowable.

Amended independent claim 7 recites the same limitations as discussed above in connection with claim 1 therefore, claim 7 is allowable for the at least the same reasons discussed above.

All other claims are dependent claim and include all of the limitations found in the independent claims. These dependent claims have further limitations which, in combination with the limitations of the independent claims are neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record. Therefore, all the dependant claims are allowable.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

No fee is believed to be due for this Amendment. Should any fees be required, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

Dated: July 21, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Joseph W. Ragusa
Joseph W. Ragusa
Registration No.: 38,586
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant